

**In the United State Patent and Trademark Office**

Appn. Number: US 10/599,868 national phase  
International Appn Nr. : WO 2005/112041 / PCT/EP2005/051405  
Applicants: Robert Desbrandes, Daniel L. Van Gent  
Tittle : REMOTE COMMUNICATION METHOD AND DEVICE  
UNSING NUCLEAR ISOMERS  
Examiner: Johannes MONDT

Givarlais, France, 2009 November 14th

|  |
|--|
| <b>Answer to USPTO Office action mailed on October 16<sup>th</sup>, 2009</b> |
|--|

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir,

First we would like to thank you for the detailed evaluation of the application.

We have been reviewing the text of claim 1 (independent claim of Group I) in relation to the following:

- The Patent Cooperation Treaty and more precisely Rules 13.1 and Rules 13.2
- Your preliminary analysis concerning the absence of a technical relationship among those inventions involving one or more of the same or corresponding special technical features.

We are aware that applying an international treaty such as the PCT may be difficult because it is not as detailed as is the US laws and regulations, or the MPEP guidelines which are applicable to US application as regarding to the unity of invention.

Considering your action, we propose to amend the claims as listed below, in particular we would like to amend claim 1 to a “system of entangled samples” which might have to be considered as a structure rather than a composition of matter as it comprises two or more separate entangled samples containing some groups of excited isomer nuclides having distant quantum couplings.

In the Benett's patent the target 22 contains initially  $^{100}\text{Mo}$  which is stable. Under irradiation by Bremsstrahlung at 10.6 MeV some  $^{99}\text{Nb}$  and  $^{99\text{m}}\text{Nb}$  are produced, and they decay in  $^{99}\text{Mo}$ , which decays in  $^{99}\text{Tc}$ . Thus for a short time, target 22 contains  $^{99\text{m}}\text{Nb}$  probably inherently entangled locally within the single sample disclosed as target 22 which is a solid in a metallic form. However,  $^{99\text{m}}\text{Nb}$  decays in 2.6 minutes while the system of entangled samples comprising  $^{93\text{m}}\text{Nb}$  in claim 2 decays in 16.13 years.

Referring to §2114 of the MPEP page 2100-53 : “Even if the prior art device performs all the functions recited in the claim, **the prior art cannot anticipate the claim if there is any structural difference**. It should be noted, however, that means plus function limitations are met by structures which are equivalent to the corresponding structures recited in the specification. In re Ruskin, 347 F.2d 843, 146 USPQ 211 (CCPA 1965) as implicitly modified by In re Donaldson, 16 F.3d 1189, 29 USPQ2d 1845 (Fed. Cir. 1994). **See also In re Robertson, 169 F.3d 743, 745, 49 USPQ2d 1949, 1951 (Fed. Cir. 1999) (The claims were drawn to a disposable diaper having three fastening elements. The reference disclosed two fastening elements that could perform the same function as the three fastening elements in the claims. The court construed the claims to require three separate elements and held that the reference did not disclose a separate third fastening element, either expressly or inherently.)**.”

[bold and underlined presentation of the text added by us]

Hence in the particular instance of a “system of entangled samples” comprising two or more separate samples having distant quantum coupling between some excited isomer nuclides, it follows that the inherent description of the excited isomer nuclides within a single sample without distant quantum coupling can not be considered prior art to the system of entangled samples as the Federal Circuit Court clearly states that a two fastening elements' diaper is not prior art to a three separate elements' diaper.

For these reasons particularly pointing out differences of interpretation in how the claimed system of entangled samples should be construed, we would like to proceed with the following election **with traverse**:

- Election of group III, claims 7-11, 19 and 21, drawn to a process of use of said system of entangled samples as amended.
- Election of the species Indium (<sup>115</sup>In49m).

We believe that new dependent claims of claim 7 to a number of species also pertain to group III: i.e. claims 22-31.

Claims that can be read over Indium (<sup>115</sup>In49m) are claims 1-22, 25, 30, 31, 34, 39 and 42. Other claims are aimed at other species.

Please note that our election does not carry any abandonment of substance within the application and do not indicate a preferred species nor a preferred embodiment.

We would like to amend the application as follows:

ABSTRACT: Unchanged.

SPECIFICATION: Amendment comprises the insertion of the matter of the English translation of the original claims from the international application in the specification as the original claims comprises subject matter in support of the current claims.

The specification amendment begins on page 6. It is respectfully asked, if allowed by the USPTO practice, to update the specification before applying the election requirement so that, should there be a need to apply for a divisional, the specification be already with the complete matter in order to alleviate future processing.

DRAWING: no amendment.

CLAIMS: Amendment begins on page 9 and the clean text version begins on page 19.

REMARKS: remarks begin on page 28.

We would like to report to you that we filed with Dr VAN GENT an application related to the present filing as it also uses isomer nuclides:

- US application 10,599, 555 [US01] (National phase of International application PCT/EP05/51404 filed on March 27<sup>th</sup>, 2005) that has the same priority date as this application but relies on a different priority specification. It is titled "METHOD AND DEVICE FOR MODIFYING THE DEEXCITATION PROBABILITY OF NUCLEAR ISOMERS". We will refer the Benett's patent you cited to the examiner, Mr. Brooke PURINTON.

Because of your initial interpretation of claim 1 as aimed to the inherent composition of matter of one sample, we respectfully ask you to consider the documents cited in US01 examination which are listed in the attached IDS for which we provided arguments dated December 14<sup>th</sup>, 2008 showing that the documents did not described inherently the claimed entangled sample with its characteristics.

Our other applications have later priority dates and are listed for consideration if needed.

We have filed, either with Dr Van Gent, or alone, the following patent filings:

- [US34] US National phase patent application Nr. 11569357 entered on 18.11.2006. It is titled "METHOD AND DEVICE FOR REMOTELY COMMUNICATING BY USING PHOTOLUMINESCENCE OR THERMOLUMINESCENCE".
- [US05] US National phase patent application Nr. 12162352 entered on 26.07.2008. It is titled "METHOD FOR GENERATING ENTANGLED ELECTRON, INFRARED-RAY, VISIBLE-RAY, ULTRAVIOLET-RAY, X-RAY AND GAMMA-RAY BEAMS".
- [US08] US National phase patent application Nr. 12306727 entered on 28.12.2008. It is titled "METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR REMOTE COMMUNICATION USING THE INTERPRETATION OF THERMOLUMINESCENCE OR PHOTOLUMINESCENCE SIGNALS".
- [US10] US National Phase patent application Nr. 12531067 entered on 13-09-2009. It is titled "PRODUCT, METHOD AND EQUIPMENT FOR REMOTE COMMUNICATION USING CHROMOGENIC MATERIALS".

Examination of this invention is ongoing with the European Patent Office.

Should we fail to properly pay submitting this answer, we renew our authorization for automatic payment of the required additional fees from the original account used for the application.

We would like to thank you for the processing of this very peculiar application, but we have been confronted with specific measurements in the carried experiments, which have lead us to the subject matter under consideration, whatever may be the current understanding of the scientific community. We hope that you will consider, should our measurements have been interpreted rightfully, the princep contribution of this application and the potential development of other extraordinary applications which could be made available to humanity. We are currently carrying numerous other experiments in many areas of technology in the limited time, which might be left to me considering my advanced age of 85, and for which we have been unable to file additional specifications due to the burden of the current ongoing examinations. Knowing that the un-filed technologies might be lost if not filed, we hope that you will be able to provide us with an equitable protection of the main aspects of this invention, which may help us in finding supports for all our developments whether already filed, or currently un-filed, thus leading to the advancement of technologies.

Sincerely

[Signed electronically]

Robert DESBRANDES  
E-QUANTIC COMMUNICATIONS  
1, allée des Cheriniers  
GIVARLAIS, FR-03190  
FRANCE